



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Handwritten mark

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,316	01/15/2002	Felix G. Racca	BEAS-02095US0	8714

23910	7590	05/04/2007
FLIESLER MEYER LLP		
650 CALIFORNIA STREET		
14TH FLOOR		
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108		

EXAMINER	
KANG, INSUN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/050,316

Applicant(s)

RACCA ET AL.

Examiner

Insun Kang

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 21-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 21-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 2/21/2007.
2. As per applicant's request, claims 7-20 have been cancelled, claims 1, 2, and 6 have been amended and claims 21-30 have been added. Claims 1-6 and 21-30 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkar et al. (US patent 6,754,659) hereinafter referred to as "Sarkar" in view of Nicholson et al. (US Patent 6,631,519) hereafter Nicholson.

Per claim 1:

Sarkar discloses:

-an introspection module that generates a catalog of generic components by introspecting original JavaBeans and transforming a plurality of implementation-specific components into a plurality of generic components, the implementation-specific components associated with a plurality of implementations (i.e. "To create the generic EJB...known Java and EJB...interact specifically with all of the Java bean support code...generated for an existing Java bean," col. 5 lines 47-55; "introspecting each of the one ore more original Java beans to determine their

Art Unit: 2193

setter/getter,” col. 4 lines 28-42; “installing the single generic EJB in an EJB container,” col. 4, lines 14-27).

Sarkar does not explicitly teach that the plurality of implementation-specific components is in heterogeneous applications created in different programming languages. However, Nicholson teaches that such a business process architecture was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to interoperate with a heterogeneous environment by automatically generating interface definitions for reducing inconsistent interface and data model definitions in a complex workflow project (i.e. col. 2 lines 5-11; col. 8 lines 48-67). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Sarkar's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Nicholson. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to seamlessly integrate with diverse applications other than Java applications ensuring data consistency by automatically generating interface definitions as suggested by Nicholson (i.e. col. 2 lines 5-11; col. 8 lines 48-67).

Sarkar further discloses: a component manager coupled to the introspection module and operable to manage said catalog generated by the introspection module by defining and organizing the generic components in said catalog; and a process designer coupled to the component manager and operable to: select at least one of the generic components from said catalog managed by the component manager (i.e. “defining a single generic EJB and installing the single generic EJB in an EJB container...generating EJB support code for each of the one or more original Java Beans,” col. 4 lines 20-27; “introspecting each of the one ore more original Java beans to determine their setter/getter,” col. 4 lines 28-42; “the generic EJB creates the helper object corresponding to the original Java bean using Java reflection...passed to the

Art Unit: 2193

generic EJB's business method," col. 4 lines 50-58); and generate a business process that includes a series of activities and transitions wherein at least one activity of said business process invokes the selected generic component from said catalog; and one or more process engines that execute said business process (i.e. "installing the single generic EJB in an EJB container," col. 4 lines 14-27)

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sarkar teaches:

An organizational repository that includes said catalog organizational data and a plurality of business processes generated by said process designer (i.e. col. 2 lines 16-41; col. 6 lines 18-29) as claimed.

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sarkar teaches:

determine an implementation associated with at least one of the implementation-specific components; retrieve the at least one of the implementation-specific components; map each of the at least one of the implementation-specific components to a generic component to yield a mapping; and save the mapping (i.e. col. 4 lines 50-58; col. 4 lines 14-27; col. 7 lines 50-56; col. 6 lines 50-58).

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sarkar teaches:

Art Unit: 2193

wherein the introspection module comprises a plurality of implementation modules, an implementation module operable to retrieve one or more implementation-specific components associated with an implementation. (i.e. col. 6 lines 1-10, 50-58; col. 7 lines 8-18).

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sarkar teaches:

- debugger coupled to the process designer and operable to detect an error of the business process (i.e. col. 6 lines 18-29) as claimed.

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sarkar teaches:

- a data warehouse coupled to the one or more process engines and operable to store transactional data describing the executed business process; and a data server coupled to the data warehouse and operable to organize the transactional data. (col. 7 lines 50-56; col. 6 lines 50-58; col. 2 lines 16-41) as claimed.

Per claim 21:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sarkar teaches:

- at least one implementation module that is used to access implementation-specific components associated with at least one of: Java, Standard Query Language (SQL), Automation, Enterprise JavaBeans (EJB), CORBA, Remote Method Invocation (RMI), Extensible Markup Language

Art Unit: 2193

(XML) schemas, Web Services and Java Naming and Directory Interface (JNDI) ("Java beans," col.5 lines 30-40 ; "EJB environment," col. 5 lines 30-41) as claimed.

Per claim 22:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Sarkar teaches:

- a binding table containing one or more entries that associate the selected implementation-specific components with generic components from said catalog (i.e. col. 6 lines 50-58).

Per claims 23-29, they are the method versions of claims 1-6 and 21-22, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 and 21-22 above.

Per claim 30, it is the computer readable medium version of claim 1, respectively, and is rejected for the same reason set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 21-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2193

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Insun Kang whose telephone number is 571-272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 6:30-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MENG AI AN can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

IK
AU 2193


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100